



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,584	01/05/2001	Arto Astala	NC28246a	3813

26349 7590 05/06/2004

JUBIN DANA  
NOKIA INC.  
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE  
MD 1-4-755  
IRVING, TX 75039

EXAMINER

PEREZ DAPLE, AARON C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,584

Applicant(s)

ASTALA ET AL.

Examiner

Aaron Perez-Daple

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/6/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Action is in response to Application filed 1/05/01, which has been fully considered.
2. Claims 1-45 are presented for examination.
3. Claims 26-45 are cancelled as drawn to a non-elected invention. See restriction requirement below.
4. This Action is non-Final.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

5. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-25, drawn to a client-server system classified in 709, subclass 203.
  - II. Claims 26-39, drawn to a method of accessing data on a remote server, classified in 709, subclass 219.
  - III. Claims 40-45, drawn to a computer product for software version control, classified in 717, subclass 170.
6. Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice, respectively. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus of group I can be used to practice a materially different process, such as accessing data over a network that is not an internet network and therefore does not require obtaining an internet address. Moreover, the process of invention

Art Unit: 2121

II could be used on a materially different network than that of group I, such as a network that does not comprise a "global unit."

7. Invention III is related to inventions I and II as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has a materially different function than that of inventions I and II, which is to monitor and control the version of software residing in a server. Therefore, invention III may be used with systems and methods materially different from inventions I and II.
8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II or III, and the search required for Group II is not required for Groups I or III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
10. During a telephone conversation with Steven Shaw (Reg. 39,368) on April 15, 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of a client-server system, claims 1-25. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 26-45 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
11. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit: 2121

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Specification***

12. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
13. The disclosure is objected to because it fails to include a description of limitations found in the claims. Specifically, lines 7-8 of claim 1 recite, "a global unit coupled to the gateway, wherein activation of the terminal is initiated by a request to the global unit." First, the Examiner notes that the only reference to a "global unit" in the specification occurs in paragraph 0010. This paragraph discloses the use of the global unit as, "for providing the internet address of the server to the terminal." This limitation is not found in the claim. Moreover, as recited, it is unclear what specifically would comprise "activation" of the terminal (e.g. does "activation" refer to turning the terminal on or to initiating an unspecified event sequence, such as authentication or a request for an address?). Paragraph 0010 further recites, "activation of the terminal initiates a request for authentication of the terminal in order to establish a shared communication session." However, the specification says nothing about initiating activation of the terminal by a request to the global unit. Rather, it is the activation of the terminal that initiates an event (e.g. a request for authentication, which authentication is disclosed as performed by either the AP or ISP). Applicant is required to either cancel the limitation from the claims or include language from the claims in the specification. No new matter should be entered.

Art Unit: 2121

14. The specification is objected to because it does not disclose performing authentication with the global unit as recited in claim 3. Although the specification discloses in paragraph 0014 that authentication may be performed by “any one of several possible units, such as the AP, ISP, or a mobile service provider (MSP),” the specification does not disclose performing authentication with the global unit. Applicant is required to either cancel the limitation from the claims or include language from the claims in the specification. No new matter should be entered.

***Drawings***

15. The drawings are objected to because Figs. 1, 1b, 2, 3 and 17 do not include descriptive labels. The figures should include text descriptions in addition to the numeric labels. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

16. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

17. **Claims 1-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, lines 3-4 of claim 1 recite “wherein the terminal includes shared communication facilities for at least two users.” Based on the specification,

Art Unit: 2121

paragraph 0062, the Examiner interprets that by “shared communication facilities” Applicant means that more than one user can use the terminal. See, for example, the first line of paragraph 0062 which recites:

Anyone having access to the terminal 20 would have access to the group level information and services, such as calendar, e-mail, bookmarks, cookies, and e-publication.

Therefore, the Examiner finds that any terminal which may be used by multiple users to access information meets the above recited limitation. The Examiner notes that any terminal which did not provide specific measures to prevent such access would inherently allow such access.

Lines 7-8 of claim 1 recite, “a global unit coupled to the gateway, wherein activation of the terminal is initiated by a request to the global unit.” It is unclear what specifically would comprise “activation” of the terminal (e.g. does “activation” refer to turning the terminal on or to initiating an unspecified event sequence, such as authentication or a request for an address?). Paragraph 0010 further recites, “activation of the terminal initiates a request for authentication of the terminal in order to establish a shared communication session.”

However, the specification says nothing about initiating activation of the terminal by a request to the global unit. Rather, it is the activation of the terminal that initiates an event (e.g. a request for authentication, which authentication is disclosed as performed by either the AP or ISP).

It is not clear what the Applicant intends to claim with respect to “a global unit” nor what function the “global unit” performs. For the purpose of applying prior art, very little weight is given to the phrase, “wherein activation of the terminal is initiated by a request to the

Art Unit: 2121

global unit.” The Examiner further interprets that the “global unit” may comprise one or more devices coupled to the gateway.

18. As for claim 2, because the specification does not disclose performing authentication with the global unit, it is unclear to the Examiner how to interpret this limitation. For the purpose of applying prior art, the Examiner finds that any teaching of authenticating a terminal on a network for starting a shared communication session with a server meets the claim limitations.

19. As for claim 17, line 3 recites “the individual specific profile” where for the sake of clarity it should recite “the administrative rights.” As presently recited, it is not clear which of the “at least one individual specific profiles” the claim refers to. Moreover, each of the users could have an individual specific profile, including those without administrative rights.

20. Claim 20 recites the limitation “the group specific profile” in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

21. As dependent claims, claims 2-25 suffer from the same deficiencies as claim 1.

### ***Prior Art Rejections***

**Examiner’s interpretation:** with respect to claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14, the term “shared communication session” is not explicitly defined by the claims nor the specification.

Paragraph 0011 of the specification recites, “downloading to the terminal the group profile configuration, and establishing a shared communication session between the terminal and the server to allow access to information and services.” This suggests that a “shared communication session” is merely a communication session between a terminal and a server,



which is consistent with the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. If Applicant intends to further limit the term “shared communication session” to using a “group profile,” as opposed to an “individual profile,” Applicant should include these limitations in the claims. For the purpose of applying prior art, the Examiner finds that a communication session between a terminal and a server is sufficient to teach “a shared communication session.” Moreover, the Examiner interprets that a “group profile” is any profile that relates to a group of individual users or network devices. Because an individual may belong to several groups, “an individual profile” may further comprise several “group profiles.”

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

22. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

23. **Claims 1, 2 and 8-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6,336,137 B1) (hereinafter Lee).

24. As for claim 1, Lee discloses a system coupled to a network, wherein the system comprises:

at least one terminal capable of wireless communication with the network through a gateway, wherein the terminal includes shared communication facilities for at least two users (col. 1, lines 56-62, “The wireless or handheld... these portable devices.”; Fig. 3);

Art Unit: 2121

a server coupled to the gateway for providing services and information management services to the terminal (web server 61, Fig. 3); and

a global unit coupled to the gateway, wherein activation of the terminal is initiated by a request to the global unit (col. 3, lines 3-15, "An end user...with a Web Server.").

25. As for claim 2, Lee discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the global unit has an address of an access provider (col. 2, lines 29-44, "The WAP gateway...telecommunications infrastructure."; col. 3, lines 3-15, "An end user...with a Web Server.").

26. As for claim 8, Lee discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the terminal comprises:  
an operating system including a driver (considered inherent for operating the device);  
a touch sensitive display coupled to the operating system for graphical display of information (col. 1, lines 56-62, "The wireless or handheld...these portable devices.");  
a user interface coupled to the operating system for providing the user with selection and input control (col. 1, lines 56-62, "The wireless or handheld...these portable devices."); and  
a browser coupled to the operating system for allowing enabled services to be selectable (col. 1, line 63 - col. 2, line 6, "The Wireless Application...standard web browser.").

27. As for claim 9, Lee discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the enabled services are located in a support server (Siebel Web Engine 71, Fig. 3).

28. As for claim 10, Lee discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the enabled services are located in an Internet (Internet 53, Fig. 3).

29. **Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al. (US 6,182,142 B1) (hereinafter Win).

Art Unit: 2121

30. As for claim 1, Win discloses a system coupled to a network, wherein the system comprises:

at least one terminal capable of wireless communication with the network through a gateway (ISP 926, Fig. 9; col. 27, lines 32-46, "Network link 920...transporting the information."), wherein the terminal includes shared communication facilities for at least two users (col. 27, lines 17-31, "Computer system 900...types of information."; Fig. 9);

a server coupled to the gateway for providing services and information management services to the terminal (server 930, Fig. 9); and

a global unit coupled to the gateway, wherein activation of the terminal is initiated by a request to the global unit (Figs. 1 and 9; col. 6, lines 48-61, "Access Server 106...by the system 2.").

31. As for claim 2, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the global unit has an address of an access provider (col. 14, lines 58-45, "The Administration Application...current resource identifier.").

32. As for claim 3, Win discloses the system of claim 2, wherein the global unit has an address of a network unit, wherein the network unit is an internet service provider and the global unit authenticates the terminal for starting a shared communication session with a group profile once the communication connection between the authenticated terminal and the server is established (col. 5, lines 28-61, "The system 2...may occur rapidly."; col. 6, lines 48-61, "Access Server 106...by the system 2.").

33. As for claim 4, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the terminal initiates authentication of the terminal before a shared communication session is established (The

communication session with the requested resource is not established until authentication is complete. See col. 6, lines 48-61, "Access Server 106...by the system 2.").

34. As for claim 6, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the user is authenticated in a network node and wherein authentication is provided for a shared communication session based on information received from a global registry (col. 6, lines 48-61, "Access Server 106...by the system 2.").

35. As for claim 7, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein a user of the terminal initiates a request for an individual communication session with the server (col. 6, lines 6-16, "The system 2...to Web resources.").

36. As for claim 9, Win discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the enabled services are located in a support server (protected servers 104 and 112, Fig. 1).

37. As for claim 10, Win discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the enabled services are located in an Internet (Fig. 1).

38. As for claim 11, Win discloses the system of claim 8, wherein the enabled services are group and individual services (col. 5, lines 28-61, "The system 2...may occur rapidly.").

39. As for claim 12, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the server comprises:  
a support server coupled to an internet service provider for providing the terminal with information management services, including access to messaging services (access server 106, Fig. 1);

a directory server coupled to the support server for providing directory services including authentication of the terminal and each user (registry server 108, Fig. 1); and

Art Unit: 2121

an application server coupled to the directory server for providing application specific services (protected servers 104 and 112, Fig. 1; see also col. 27, lines 47-55, "Computer system 900...as described herein.").

40. As for claim 13, Win discloses the system of claim 12, wherein the terminal is authenticated by a network unit to start a shared communication session and each user is authenticated by the support server for starting an individual communication session (col. 6, lines 48-61, "Access Server 106...by the system 2.").
41. As for claim 14, Win discloses the system of claim 12, wherein the application server transmits a group specific profile to the terminal of a specified group when a shared communication session is active and transmits an individual specific profile to the terminal when an individual communication session is active (col. 5, lines 28-61, "The system 2...may occur rapidly."; col. 6, lines 39-47, "Integration Tools 115...Registry Repository 110."; col. 6, line 65 - col. 7, line 5, "When the user selects...user's name and roles.").
42. As for claim 15, Win discloses the system of claim 14, wherein the group specific profile and the individual specific profile include language selection unique to that profile (col. 6, lines 39-47, "Integration Tools 115...Registry Repository 110.").
43. As for claim 16, Win discloses the system of claim 14, wherein at least one individual specific profile has administrative rights to modify the group specific profile (col. 5, lines 28-40, "The system 2 enables...and Hotline Staff.").
44. As for claim 17, Win discloses the system of claim 16, wherein at least one parameter of the services and the group specific profile can be updated by the user having the individual

Art Unit: 2121

specific profile (col. 5, lines 28-40, "The system 2 enables...and Hotline Staff."; col. 5, line 64 - col. 6, line 5, "The system 2...administration time savings.").

45. As for claim 18, Win discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the updated parameter is stored in a database of the server when a change session is terminated (col. 13, lines 2-8, "Administration Application...in Registry Server 108.").

46. As for claim 19, Win discloses the system of claim 18, wherein after the change session is terminated, updated content is selectable from any terminal of the specified group (col. 13, lines 2-8, "Administration Application...in Registry Server 108."; col. 14, lines 6-19, "Defining roles involves...are then defined.").

47. As for claim 20, Win discloses the system of claim 12, wherein at least one parameter of the services and the group specific profile can be updated by any terminal that is part of the group (col. 13, lines 2-8, "Administration Application...in Registry Server 108."; col. 14, lines 6-19, "Defining roles involves...are then defined.").

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

48. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

49. **Claims 5 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Lee.

Art Unit: 2121

50. As for claim 5, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the global unit comprises a global registry including the addresses of resources on the network, including an access provider and an internet service provider (col. 14, line 58 - col. 15, line 45, "The Administration Application...current resource identifier."; Figs. 1 and 9). Win does not specifically disclose that these network resources may comprise a mobile service provider. Lee discloses a network which includes a mobile service provider for transmitting data between wireless devices and network resources using the WAP protocol (WAP gateway 51 and web server 61, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Win by including the address of a mobile service provider in order to transmit data between wireless devices and network resources using the WAP protocol, as taught by Lee.
51. As for claim 8, Win does not specifically disclose the use of wireless terminal comprising a touch sensitive display. Lee teaches the use of a wireless terminal comprising a touch sensitive display (col. 1, lines 56-62, "The wireless or handheld...these portable devices."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Win by including a wireless terminal comprising a touch sensitive display, because this would allow for communication with the many existing handheld and wireless devices comprising such a display, as taught by Lee.
52. **Claims 21-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win in view of Huang et al. (US 6,553,375 B1) (hereinafter Huang).
53. As for claim 21, Win discloses the system of claim 12, wherein the support server comprises:

Art Unit: 2121

an application server (protected servers 104 and 112, Fig. 1);

a login service unit coupled to the application server for authenticating the terminal for a shared session and an individual session (access server 106, Fig. 1);

a profile service unit coupled to the application server for providing and updating shared session profiles and individual session profiles (registry server 108, Fig. 1); and

an administrative service unit coupled to the application server for administration of the support server and a network application server (administration application 114, Fig. 1).

Win does not specifically disclose a global upgrade server for transmitting software upgrades to an upgrade service unit. The Examiner interprets that in teaching receipt of downloaded application programs (col. 27, lines 47-55, "Computer system 900...as described herein."), Win inherently teaches an upgrade service unit when combined with an upgrade server, as taught below. Huang teaches a global upgrade server for transmitting software upgrades to a remote terminal in order to maintain the most current software (col. 4, line 53 - col. 5, line 17, "In the present invention...to the server, etc."; col. 6, lines 16-31, "In both situations...by the client."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Win by adding a global upgrade server for transmitting software upgrades to a remote terminal in order to maintain the most current software, as taught by Huang.

54. As for claim 22, Win teaches a network for delivering applications and data to remote terminals via a network which may include the internet or world wide web. It is understood by those of ordinary skill in the art that information delivered over the internet may include advertising information. "Official Notice" is given that it is both known and expected in the art to configure advertising services based on a user profile for the purpose of more effective



Art Unit: 2121

advertising. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Win by including an advertising service unit coupled to the application server for configuring advertised services for the appropriate profile associated with the session that is active on the terminal, because this would allow for more effective advertising. See Herz et al. (US 6,571,279 B1) for an example of the prior art teaching these limitations.

55. As for claim 23, Win teaches the system of claim 21, wherein at least one parameter of the group profile and individual profile can be changed by the application server (col. 5, lines 28-61, "The system 2...may occur rapidly.").

56. As for claim 24, Win discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the global unit comprises:  
a firewall unit for providing secured access (firewall 118, Fig. 1);  
a global address server coupled to the firewall unit for storing the internet address of the server associated with the terminal (registry server 108, Fig. 1).

Although Win teaches downloading application programs (software) from remote servers, which application programs might reasonably include updated data, Win does not *explicitly* disclose a global upgrade server coupled to the global address server for providing *updated* data, including software, to the server and the terminal. Huang teaches a global upgrade server for providing updated data to remote terminals in order to maintain the most current software (col. 4, line 53 - col. 5, line 17, "In the present invention...to the server, etc."; col. 6, lines 16-31, "In both situations...by the client."). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Win to include providing updated data, including software, to the server and the terminal in order to maintain the most current software, as taught by Huang.

Art Unit: 2121

57. As for claim 25, Win discloses downloading executable software but does not explicitly disclose a global upgrade server for the reasons above. Huang discloses a global upgrade server wherein an upgrade service unit receives, from the global upgrade server, a software product comprising:

executable software (col. 3, lines 15-22, "In accordance with...of the applications.");

at least one identification of the software product (col. 5, lines 6-17, "Each item in...to the server, etc."); and

an address of the server from where the software can be downloaded, wherein the global upgrade server responds to the server identifying from where the software product is available for downloading (col. 4, line 53 - col. 5, line 17, "In the present invention...to the server, etc.");

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Win by including a global upgrade software with the limitations above in order to maintain the most current software in remote terminals, as taught by Huang above.

### *Conclusion*

58. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,308,203 B1, note Fig. 1; US 6,571,279 B1, note teaches advertising specific to user profile; US 5,848,064, teaches software upgrades for wireless terminals; US 6,643,506 B1, note teaches software upgrades for wireless terminals; US 6,233,576 B1, note authorization control; US 6,122,741, note teaches global registry; US 6,575,361, note teaches global registry; US 6,460,141 B1, note Fig. 1; US 5,220,604, note group hierarchies; US


Art Unit: 2121

6,463,474 B1, note Fig. 3; US 6,584,505 B1, note Fig. 1; US 6,307,837 B1, note Fig. 1; US 6,529,936 B1, note Fig. 1; US 5,991,810, note Fig. 1; US 6,519,571 B1, note teaches customizing user interface based on user profile.

59. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Perez-Daple whose telephone number is 703-305-4897. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 703-308-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 4/30/04

Aaron Perez-Daple



**Anthony Knight**  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
**Group 3600**